



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

mc

| APPLICATION NO. | FILING DATE | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. | CONFIRMATION NO. |
|-----------------|-------------|----------------------|---------------------|------------------|
| 10/519,925      | 01/03/2005  | Tasuku Honjo         | Q85588              | 9146             |

65565 7590 07/06/2007  
SUGHRUE-265550  
2100 PENNSYLVANIA AVE. NW  
WASHINGTON, DC 20037-3213

|          |
|----------|
| EXAMINER |
|----------|

OUSPENSKI, ILIA I

|          |              |
|----------|--------------|
| ART UNIT | PAPER NUMBER |
|----------|--------------|

1644

|           |               |
|-----------|---------------|
| MAIL DATE | DELIVERY MODE |
|-----------|---------------|

07/06/2007

PAPER

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

**Office Action Summary**

Application No.

10/519,925

Applicant(s)

HONJO ET AL.

Examiner

ILIA OUSPENSKI

Art Unit

1644

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**Status**

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 14 May 2007.
- 2a) ☐ This action is FINAL. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

**Disposition of Claims**

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-32 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) 1-11, 15 and 17-32 is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 12-14 and 16 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

**Application Papers**

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119**

- 12) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☒ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
1. ☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- \* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

**Attachment(s)**

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date 1/3/05; 11/16/06.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. \_\_\_\_\_.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_.

### DETAILED ACTION

1. Applicant's remarks, filed on 05/14/2007, are acknowledged.

**Claims 1 – 32 are pending.**

Claims 7 – 11 and 18 – 26 stand withdrawn from consideration as being drawn to non-statutory subject matter, or being improper dependent claims.

Claims 1 – 6, 15, 17, and 27 – 32 stand withdrawn from further consideration pursuant to 37 CFR 1.142(b) as being drawn to nonelected Inventions/Species, there being no allowable generic or linking claim. Election was made without traverse in the reply filed on 02/16/2007.

***Claims 12 – 14 and 16 are under consideration in the instant application.***

2. Applicant's election of the species, wherein the method comprises administering an inhibitor of PD-1, in the reply filed on 05/14/2007 is acknowledged. Because applicant did not distinctly and specifically point out the supposed errors in the species election requirement, the election of species has been treated as an election without traverse (MPEP § 818.03(a)).

3. Receipt is acknowledged of papers submitted under 35 U.S.C. 119(a)-(d), which papers have been placed of record in the file.

Art Unit: 1644

4. The title of the invention is not descriptive. A new title is required that is clearly indicative of the invention *to which the claims are directed*.

5. Applicant is reminded of the proper language and format for an abstract of the disclosure. The abstract should be in narrative form and generally limited to a single paragraph on a separate sheet within the range of 50 to 150 words.

6. The following is a quotation of the **second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112**.

*The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.*

7. Claims 12 – 14 and 16 are rejected under **35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph**, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

A. Claims 12 – 14 and 16 are indefinite in the recitation of “immunosuppressive signal inhibitor of PD-1,” because it is unclear whether the phrase means an inhibitor of the immunosuppressive signal of PD-1, or an inhibitor a PD-1 signal, which inhibitor is immunosuppressive. Therefore, one of ordinary skill in the art would not be reasonably apprised of the metes and bounds of the claimed invention.

For examination purposes, the former interpretation is assumed.

B. Claim 12 is indefinite in the recitation of a method, because the claim does not clearly set forth a preamble which indicates the purpose or endpoint of the method steps.

Art Unit: 1644

Applicant is reminded that any amendment must point to a basis in the specification so as not to add new matter. See MPEP 714.02 and 2163.06.

8. The following is a quotation of the **first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112**:

*The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.*

9. Claims 12 – 14 and 16 are rejected under **35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph**, as failing to comply with the enablement requirement. The claims contain subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to enable one skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and/or use the invention.

The specification does not provide a sufficient enabling description of a method for immunopotential in vivo, or a method for treatment of cancer, by administering the recited agent.

The specification does not enable one of skill in the art to practice the invention as claimed without undue experimentation. Factors to be considered in determining whether undue experimentation is required to practice the claimed invention are summarized in In re Wands (858 F2d 731, 737, 8 USPQ2d 1400, 1404 (Fed. Cir. 1988)). The factors most relevant to this rejection are the scope of the claim, the amount of direction or guidance provided, limited working examples, the unpredictability in the art and the amount of experimentation required to enable one of skill in the art to practice the claimed invention.

In evaluating the facts of the instant case, the following is noted: in applying therapies based on T cell costimulatory molecules, in vitro and even animal model studies have not correlated well with in vivo clinical trial results in patients. Since the efficacy of therapeutic antibodies can be species- and model-dependent, it is unpredictable whether reliance on the experimental observations in the experimental model described in the instant specification provide the basis for employing the claimed antibodies for immunopotential in vivo, or for treating cancer. For example, Blazar et al. (J. Immunol., 1996, 157: 3250 – 3259; see entire document, in particular, e.g. page 3257, column 2 first paragraph) disclose that issues such as tissue distribution, half-life, affinity and avidity obtained with various reagents targeting costimulatory molecules might prove to be highly important in achieving a therapeutic effect. Therefore, any conclusion regarding the efficacy of costimulatory modulation on altering in vivo immune response should be interpreted in light of the specific reagent used (Blazar et al., see page 3257, column 2, paragraph 1). Thus there is no evidence that the animal model used in the experiments disclosed in the specification would be predictive of the therapeutic methods encompassed by the claims.

Pharmaceutical therapies in the absence of in vivo clinical data are unpredictable for the following reasons; (1) the protein may be inactivated before producing an effect, i.e., such as proteolytic degradation, immunological inactivation or due to an inherently short half-life of the protein; (2) the protein may not reach the target area because, i.e.

Art Unit: 1644

the protein may not be able to cross the mucosa or the protein may be adsorbed by fluids, cells and tissues where the protein has no effect; and (3) other functional properties, known or unknown, may make the protein unsuitable for in vivo therapeutic use, i.e. such as adverse side effects prohibitive to the use of such treatment. See page 1338, footnote 7 of Ex parte Aggarwal, 23 USPQ2d 1334 (PTO Bd. Pat App. & Inter. 1992).

In view of insufficient guidance by the instant specification and the lack of predictability of the art to which the invention pertains with respect to the PD-1 signaling pathway, undue experimentation would be required to practice the claimed methods with a reasonable expectation of success, absent a specific and detailed description in applicant's specification of the clinical protocols, and absent working examples providing evidence that the claimed methods are effective for immunopotential in vivo or for treating cancer.

10. Claims 12 – 14 and 16 are rejected under **35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph**, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. The claims contain subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventors, at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention.

Applicant is not in possession of the claimed methods, because applicant is not in possession of a generically recited "immunosuppressive signal inhibitor of PD-1."

Applicant has disclosed a single example of a PD-1 signaling inhibitor, an anti-PD-1 antibody (e.g. page 35), while the instant claims encompass in their breadth any agent capable of inhibiting PD-1 signaling. A person of skill in the art cannot envision all the contemplated structural possibilities of PD-1 inhibitors, because it was well known in

Art Unit: 1644

the art at the time the invention was made that molecules having highly diverse structural and biochemical properties can function as “inhibitors.” For example, Huang (Pharmacology and Therapeutics, 2000, 86: 201 – 215; see entire document) reviews e.g. on page 202 the daunting task faced by the skilled artisan in developing small molecule regulators of protein function, and notes that the process requires long periods of trial and error testing. The structure of such molecules cannot be readily envisioned by one of skill in the art based upon the written description provided in the specification as-filed.

The written description requirement can be met by “show[ing] that an invention is complete by disclosure of sufficiently detailed, relevant identifying characteristics ... i.e., complete or partial structure, other physical and/or chemical properties, functional characteristics when coupled with a known or disclosed correlation between function and structure, or some combination of such characteristics.” Guidelines, 66 Fed. Reg. at 1106. Adequate written description requires more than a mere statement that it is part of the invention.

Vas-Cath Inc. v. Mahurkar, 19 USPQ2d 1111, makes clear that “applicant must convey with reasonable clarity to those skilled in the art that, as of the filing date sought, he or she was in possession of the invention. The invention is, for purposes of the written description inquiry, whatever is now claimed.” (See page 1117.) The specification does not “clearly allow persons of ordinary skill in the art to recognize that [he or she] invented what is claimed.” (See Vas-Cath at page 1116.). Consequently, Applicant was not in possession of the instant claimed invention. See University of California v. Eli Lilly and Co. 43 USPQ2d 1398.

Applicant is directed to the Guidelines for the Examination of Patent Applications Under the 35 U.S.C. 112, ¶ 1 “Written Description” Requirement, Federal Register, Vol. 66, No. 4, pages 1099-1111, January 5, 2001.



11. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of **35 U.S.C. 102** that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless --

*(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.*

12. Claims 12 – 14 and 16 are rejected under **35 U.S.C. 102(e)** as being anticipated by Wood et al. (US Patent No. 6,808,710; see entire document).

Wood et al. teach methods of cancer treatment, wherein an immune response against a tumor specific antigen is induced (i.e. potentiated) by administering an agent that inhibits the inhibitory (i.e. immunosuppressive) activity of PD-1 (e.g. columns 54 – 56, more specifically columns 55 – 56, bridging paragraph), wherein the agent may be an anti-PD-1 antibody (e.g. column 48 lines 52 – 58).

Wood et al. do not specifically state that their method suppresses cancer metastasis; however, one of skill in the art would immediately recognize that a method which treats cancer by inducing an immune response against tumor antigens inherently induces an immune response against metastasizing cells, and therefore suppresses metastasis.


Therefore, the reference teachings anticipate the instant claimed invention.

**13. Conclusion: no claim is allowed.**

14. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to ILIA OUSPENSKI whose telephone number is 571-272-2920. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday 9 - 5.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Christina Chan can be reached on 571-272-0841. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.



ILIA OUSPENSKI, Ph.D.

Patent Examiner

Art Unit 1644

June 20, 2007